Natural Resources Conservation Service

Application Ranking Summary

Wildlife habitat Riparian- Wetland

Program:	Ranking Date:	Application Number:
Ranking Tool: Wildlife habitat Riparian- Wetland		Applicant:
Final Ranking Score:		Address:
Planner:		Telephone:
Farm Location:		

National Priorities Addressed

Issue Questions		
Healthy Plant and Animal Communities: Wildlife Habitat Conservation – Will the proposed project assist the producer to:		
1. a. Retain wildlife and plant benefits on land exiting the Conservation Reserve Program?		
1. b. Address and support existing conservation initiatives such as but not limited to the following or new conservation initiatives that support State, National or tribal fish or wildlife plans: Sage Grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, Longleaf Pine, New England-New York Forestry		
1. c. Benefit federally listed threatened and endangered, at-risk, candidate, fish or wildlife species of concern?		
1. d. Benefit prioritized native habitat critical to a fish or wildlife species?		
1. e. Increase, improve or establish pollinator habitat?		
1. f. Eradicate or control prioritized noxious or invasive species?		
1. g. Benefit declining or important aquatic wildlife species prioritized in the State WHIP Plan?		
1. h. Implement conservation practices which benefit prioritized fish or wildlife species in forested areas?		
1. i. Establish habitat on pivot corners and irregular areas on agricultural land?		
1. j. Provide self-sustaining habitat for prioritized fish and wildlife while reducing net carbon emissions or boosting carbon storage (e.g., warm season perennial grasses, trees or shrubs)?		
1. k. Benefit migration and other movement corridors for prioritized wildlife?	Yes O or No O	
Business Lines – Conservation Implementation - Additional Ranking Considerations – Will the applicant in the proposed project:		
2. a. Complete habitat development within the first two years of the agreement?	Yes O or No O	

State Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	
Riparian / Wetland Targeted Habitat and Priority Species Benefited	
1. The project benefits at least three of the top ten key habitat types identified in the Utah Comperhensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Two of the key habitat types must be tageted riparian or wetland habitat.	
2. The project benefits at least two of the top ten key habitat types identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. One of the key habitat types must be targeted riparian or wetland habitat.	
3. The project benefits one of the top ten key habitat types identified in the Utah Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. The habitat type is considered riparian or wetland habitat.	
4. The project benefits at least 1 designated priority 1 species.	
5. The project benefits at least 1 designated priority 2 species, but does not benefit a priority 1 species.	
6. The project benefits at least 1 designated priority 3 species, but does not benefit a priority 1 or priority 2 species.	
Habitat Improvement	
7. The difference between the "After" Habitat Score and the "Before" Habitat score is greater than 0.75.	
8. The difference between the "After" Habitat Score and the "Before" Habitat score is between 0.5 and	

0.74.	
9. The difference between the "After" Habitat Score and the "Before" Habitat score is between 0.25 and 0.49.	
10. The difference between the "After" Habitat Score and the "Before" Habitat score is less than 0.25.	
Conservation Planning	
11. The project is in an area that is covered by an approved areawide plan as defined by the National Planning Procedures Handbook and address 3 or more SWAPA resource concerns.	
12. Is the applicant planning to install all of the practices within the first 3 years?	
13. Has an econmic analysis been conducted on the project and the potential effects discussed with the applicant?	

Local Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
Project Setting	
1. The project is within or contiguous with an area protected for wildlife.	Yes O or No O
2. The project is within one mile of an area protected for wildlife.	Yes O or No O
3. The project addresses specific components of an existing Endangered Secies Recovery Plan, DWR Species Management Plan, CRMP or Areawide Resources Plan.	Yes O or No O
Partnerships	
4. The project leverages NRCS funds and/or staff time by also using funds and/or staff time of any cooperating partners (USFWS, DWR, UPCD, or other groups).	Yes O or No O
5. Partners plan to contribute >50% of the total project cost.	Yes O or No O
6. Partners plan to contribute 25 - 50% of the total project cost.	Yes O or No O
7. Partners plan to contribute 10 -24% of the total project cost.	Yes O or No O
8. The project has a monitoring plan conducted by a university, federal, state agency or a NGO.	Yes O or No O

Land Use:

Resource Concerns	Practices
Ranking Score	
Efficiency:	
Local Issues:	
State Issues:	
National Issues:	
Final Ranking Score:	

This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your application is selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded.

Notes:

	Application Signature Not Required for Contract Development unless required by State policy:
Signature Date:	Signature Date: